

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/564,616	07/26/2006	Mihara Kiyoo	(05:153)	9854	
2119 RONALD E. O	7590 02/22/201 GREIGG	EXAM	EXAMINER		
GREIGG & GREIGG P.L.L.C.			PASCUA, JES F		
ALEXANDRI	TAN STREET, UNIT ( A. VA 22314	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			3782		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/22/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## **Advisory Action** Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/564,616	KIYOO, MIHARA		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Jes F. Pascua	3782		

	Jes F. Pascua	3782	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 01 February 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must limely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (1).	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date in have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any semed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	te extension fee action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL  2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CER 41 37 must be f	iled within two months	of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b			cause
<ul> <li>(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further core</li> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> </ul>		E below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or		lucing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> </ol>		mpliant Amendment (f	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>			
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		•	_
7. \(\subseteq  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s), a) [\) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:		be entered and an ex	planation of
Claim(s) rejected: <u>5-14.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	hafan and the data of Clinica Nic		be set and
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	I and/or appellant fails	to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	try is below or attache	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. $\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. Other:			
	/Jes F. Pascua/		

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3782

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The cancellation of claim 15 overcomes the rejection of that claim under 35 USC 112, second paragraph and 35 USC 103(a).

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Motonaka et al. clearly shows that it is known in the art of valve mechanisms to be attached to tightly closed bags to provide the suction connector (2') with a vent (2a) formed in its center, wherein the vent (2a) is recessed to provide the suction connector with a shape which does not project relative to the peripheral edge (2b) on a side of the suction connector facing outside the tightly closed bag more than the thickness (i.e., heightly of the peripheral edge (2b). Furthermore, Wu clearly shows a valve base (3) to be mounted on the inner surface of a tightly closed bag protion adapted to be joined to a suction connector (6) with the tightly closed bag held therebetween. There is no need for the suction connector of Motonaka et al. to be mounted on the bag at its peripheral edge, since the suction connect of Wu clearly shows this feature.